

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were presented for examination and claims 1-29 were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 1, 27 and 29 have been amended and claims 30-33 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-33 will be pending in this application, of which claims 1, 15, 26 and 29 are independent. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 27 was objected by the Examiner due to informalities. Claim 27 was inadvertently mistyped as dependent upon itself. Applicant hereby amends the claim to make it depended on independent claim 26. Applicant submits claim 27 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 was amended to address antecedent basis informalities for dependent claims 4-6 and 8-11 that refer to steps by letters from the independent claim. As such, Applicant amended claim 1 merely to address these informalities. Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. New dependent claims 30-33 were added. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant submits that dependent claims 30-33 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-29 are rejected as anticipated by the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, December 1, 1991, “Administrative Role Configuration with Control Lists.” (“IBM Publication”). Claims 1, 15, 26 and 29 are independent claims. Claims 2-14, 16-25 and 27-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claims 1, 15 and 26 respectively. Applicant traverses this rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the IBM Publication fails to meet this exacting legal standard because it fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1, 15, 26 and 29.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 1 is directed towards a method, independent claims 15 and 29 to systems and independent claim 26 to an article of manufacture for providing secure access to applications. Independent claims 1, 15, 26 and 29 each recite receiving a request from a user to execute an application, determining a minimal set of privileges necessary or required for the user to use or execute the requested application and invoking an execution environment for the user having the determined set of privileges.

The IBM Publication does not disclose determining a minimal set of privileges necessary for the user to use the requested application and invoking an execution environment for the user having the determined set of privileges. Rather, the system of the IBM Publication uses a privilege control list to assign user privileges to access a file on a per file basis. The privilege control list defines the circumstances under which privileges will be granted to a file (see page 3, line 34 – page 4, line 1) – not the minimum set of privileges to use a requested application as in

the claimed invention. The IBM Publication discusses denying a user access to a file if the user does not have one of the necessary privileges to use the file accessed by the application. Thus, the privilege control list of the IBM Publication is filed based and not based on use of the requested application.

Nor does the IBM Publication disclose providing the user with an environment having minimal set of privileges to execute the requested application. The system of the IBM publication denies or grants access to files within a user's environment - it does not provide an environment with the minimal set of privileges to use the requested application. In contrast, the claimed invention determines the minimal set of privileges needed by the user to use the requested application and invokes an execution environment having those minimal set of privileges. Thus, IBM also fails to disclose providing the user with an environment having the minimal set of privileges to use the requested application.

Because IBM does not disclose determining a minimal set of computing privileges necessary for the user to use the requested application and invoking an execution environment for the user having the determined set of privileges, Applicant submits independent claims 1, 15, 26 and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-14 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 16-25 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 15. Claims 27-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 26. Thus, Applicant submits dependent claims 2-14, 16-25 and 27-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

NEW DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicants hereby add new dependent claims 30-33. Claim 30 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claim 31 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 15. Claim 32 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 26. Claim 33 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29. For the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1, 15, 26 and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant submits dependent claims 30-33 are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

These dependent claims also provide additional basis for patentability of the claimed invention. Each of the dependent claims 30-33 recite determining the minimal set of privileges required by the user to execute the application in response to the request. The system of the IBM Publication does not determine privileges required by the user to execute the application in response to the user's request for the application. Rather, the IBM Publication merely determines privileges to access a file based on a privilege control list previously configured by an administrator prior to a request for an application. The IBM Publication does determine privileges responsive to the request. Thus, the IBM Publication does not detract from the patentability of the subject matter of these dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: March 4, 2007

/ Christopher J. McKenna /
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000
(617) 248-4000